

publication, or the first workday thereafter. Case briefs or other written comments, from interested parties may be submitted not later than 30 days after the date of publication of this notice. Rebuttal briefs and rebuttal comments, limited to issues raised in the case briefs, may be filed not later than 37 days after the date of publication. The Department will publish the final results of review, including the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such written comments or hearing.

This notice serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 353.26 to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This administrative review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 353.22.

Dated: September 15, 1995.

Susan G. Esserman,
Assistant Secretary for Import
Administration.

[FR Doc. 95-23792 Filed 9-25-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-M

[(A-122-820); (A-122-822); (A-122-823)]

Amended Final Determinations of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Antidumping Orders: Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products and Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate From Canada

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

SUMMARY: On July 11, 1995, the U.S.-Canada Binational Panel ("Panel") affirmed the Department of Commerce's ("the Department") remand determinations in these cases. On August 23, 1995, the Binational Secretariat, United States Section, published a notice of completion of panel review and noted that no request for an extraordinary challenge committee had been filed. (Notice of Completion of Panel Review, 60 FR 43773). As a result, the Department is amending the final determination of sales at less than fair value with respect to corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products and cut-to-length carbon steel plate from Canada. For all entries made on or after the date of publication of this

notice, Commerce will direct the U.S. Customs Service ("Customs") to require a cash deposit for each entry in an amount equal to the estimated antidumping duty margins as described in the "Suspension of Liquidation" section of this notice.

EFFECTIVE DATE: September 26, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Elizabeth Patience or Jean Kemp, Office of Agreements Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-3793.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On July 9, 1993, the Department published a notice of its Final Determination of Sales at Less than Fair Value covering, among other products, certain corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products and certain cut-to-length carbon steel plate from Canada. 58 FR 37099.

The Department's determination subsequently was appealed to a U.S.-Canada Binational Panel, pursuant to Article 1904 of the United States-Canada Free Trade Agreement and title IV of the United States-Canada Free Trade Implementation Act of 1988, 19 U.S.C. 1516a(g)(1989). On April 1, 1994, the Department published an amended determination pursuant to an order from the Panel, correcting certain ministerial errors. 59 FR 15373. On October 31, 1994 and May 1, 1995, the Panel remanded the determination so that the Department could address certain issues regarding the calculation of the weighted-average dumping margins for certain respondents in this proceeding. On January 30, 1995 and May 31, 1995, the Department issued its final remand determinations with recalculated estimated margins. The Panel affirmed the Department's remand determination on July 11, 1995. No request for an extraordinary challenge has been filed and a Notice of Completion of Panel Review has been published by the Binational Secretariat.

Suspension of Liquidation

Since the panel proceedings are now final, we are directing Customs to require a cash deposit in an amount equal to:

| Producer/manufacturer/exporter | Weighted-average margin percentage |
|---|------------------------------------|
| Corrosion-Resistant Steel Flat Products: Dofasco | 11.71 |

| Producer/manufacturer/exporter | Weighted-average margin percentage |
|--|------------------------------------|
| Stelco | 22.70 |
| All Others | 18.71 |
| Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate: IPSCO | 0.06 |
| Stelco | 68.70 |
| All Others | 61.88 |

We will instruct Customs to continue to suspend liquidation and collect cash deposits at the above rates for all entries of corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products and cut-to-length carbon steel plate from Canada entered or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after the date of publication of this notice. Because IPSCO's rate is *de minimis*, IPSCO is excluded from the antidumping duty order on plate from Canada. We will instruct Customs to cease suspension of liquidation and collection of cash deposits and to liquidate all suspended entries of IPSCO plate without regard to antidumping duties.

Dated: September 15, 1995.

Susan G. Esserman,
Assistant Secretary for Import
Administration.

[FR Doc. 95-23793 Filed 9-25-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-M

[A-122-601]

Brass Sheet and Strip From Canada; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of final results of antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: On April 27, 1995, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on brass sheet and strip from Canada. The review period is January 1, 1992, through December 31, 1992. The review covers one manufacturer/exporter.

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results. Based on our analysis of the comments received, we have changed our results from those presented in our preliminary results.

EFFECTIVE DATE: September 26, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sally Hastings or John Kugelman, Office of Antidumping Compliance, Import

Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482-4366 or 482-0649, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On April 27, 1995, the Department published in the Federal Register (60 FR 20670) the preliminary results of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on brass sheet and strip from Canada (52 FR 1217, January 12, 1987).

Applicable Statute and Regulations

The Department has now completed this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Tariff Act). Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute and to the Department's regulations refer to the provisions as they existed on December 31, 1994.

Scope of the Review

Imports covered by this review are brass sheet and strip, other than leaded and tin brass sheet and strip. The chemical composition of the covered products is currently defined in the Copper Development Association (C.D.A.) 200 Series or the Unified Numbering System (U.N.S.) C2000. Products whose chemical composition is defined by other C.D.A. or U.N.S. series are not covered by this order.

The physical dimensions of the products covered by this review are brass sheet and strip of solid rectangular cross section over 0.006 inches (0.15 millimeters) through 0.188 inches (4.8 millimeters) in finished thicknesses or gauge, regardless of width. Coiled, wound-on-reels (traverse wound), and cut-to-length products are included.

During the review period such merchandise was classifiable under Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) subheadings 7409.21.00 and 7409.29.00. Although the HTS subheadings are provided for convenience and for Customs purposes, the written description of the scope of this order remains dispositive.

This review covers one Canadian manufacturer/exporter, Wolverine Tube (Canada) Inc. (Wolverine), and the period January 1, 1992 through December 31, 1992.

Analysis of Comments Received

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results. The petitioners in this case are Outokumpu American

Brass, Hussey Copper Ltd., The Miller Company, Olin Corporation-Brass Group, Revere Copper Products, Inc., International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, International Union-Allied Industrial Workers of America (AFL-CIO), Mechanics Educational Society of America (Local 56), and the United Steelworkers of America (AFL-CIO/CLC). Petitioners timely submitted a case brief. Respondent Wolverine did not file a case brief and none of the interested parties submitted a rebuttal brief.

Comment 1: Petitioners agree with the Department's use of their submitted fabrication and packing cost information as best information available in calculating Wolverine's cost of production (COP) and constructed value (CV). However, petitioners argue that the Department should adjust the daily metal prices submitted by Wolverine to include yield losses, transportation costs, and Wolverine's use of virgin metals and scrap.

Department's Position: We agree in principle with the petitioners' comment. However, since petitioners used Wolverine's unadjusted metal prices in their August 27, 1993 allegation of sales below cost and because neither petitioners nor respondent provided information concerning yield losses, transportation costs, or Wolverine's use of virgin metals and scrap in their sales-below-cost allegation, we have no information which would enable us to quantify these items. Therefore, we have continued to use the respondent's submitted metal prices, unadjusted for yield losses, transportation costs, and utilization of virgin metals and scrap, as cost of materials.

Comment 2: Petitioners state that there is no indication that Wolverine's submitted metal prices include the reported Goods & Services Tax (GST) of seven percent. Petitioners argue that the Department incorrectly compared GST-exclusive COPs to GST-inclusive home market prices, thus understating the number of home market sales below the cost of production.

Department's Position: We disagree. Line 109 of the computer program defines *net price*, which we used only for price-to-price comparisons, not the sales-below-cost test. In line 133 of the computer program we compared a GST-exclusive *unit price* to a GST-exclusive COP.

Comment 3: Petitioners contend that because the Department used in its COP analysis U.S. fabrication costs submitted by the petitioners as best information available, we should have adjusted these costs for the differences between U.S. and Canadian labor costs.

Department's Position: We agree with the petitioners. In these final results, we have accounted for such differences by using Canadian labor costs based on the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) Hourly Compensation Costs for Nonferrous Metal Manufacturing in Canada in 1992, rather than the 1991 figures submitted by the petitioners in their August 27, 1993 sales-below-cost allegation.

Comment 4: Petitioners argue that the Department should adjust Wolverine's general and administrative (G&A) expenses to include costs associated with Wolverine's closure of its New Westminster facility and Wolverine's amortization costs.

Department's Position: It is the Department practice to include in G&A those expenses relating to factory closure, even if the factory does not produce subject merchandise, because those expenses are a general cost of doing business. (See *Silicon Metal From Argentina: Final Results of Administrative Review*, 58 FR 65336 (December 14, 1993) and *Sweaters Wholly or in Chief Weight of Man-made Fiber From Taiwan: Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value*, 55 FR 34585 (August 23, 1990)). In its Supplemental Cost Response, submitted on April 28, 1994, Wolverine stated that it did not include the New Westminster expenses in its allocation of G&A in the previously submitted cost data. Therefore, we have allocated a portion of the New Westminster factory closure expenses to Wolverine's Fergus, Ontario, Canada facility (which is the sole Wolverine factory that produces brass sheet and strip), and have added that portion to our calculation of G&A.

With regard to Wolverine's amortization expense, we saw no evidence and the petitioner has provided no basis or grounds to believe that the G&A expense reported for the Fergus facility does not include a portion of Wolverine's corporate amortization expense. For this reason, we have not altered the G&A expense, other than for the closure expenses discussed above.

Final Results of the Review

As a result of our analysis of the comments received, we determine that the following margin exists for the period January 1, 1992 through December 31, 1992:

| Manufacturer/exporter | Percent margin |
|-----------------------|----------------|
| Wolverine | 25.49 |

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between United States price (USP) and FMV may vary from the percentage stated above. The Department will issue appraisal instructions directly to the Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of these final results of review for all shipment of Canadian brass sheet and strip entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for the reviewed company will be the rate listed above; (2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies not listed above, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a previous review, or the original less than fair value (LTFV) investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (4) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this or any previous review conducted by the Department, the cash deposit rate will be 8.10 percent, the "all others" rate established in the LTFV investigation.

These cash deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice serves as a final reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 353.26 to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 353.34(d). Timely written notification of return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

This administrative review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1)

of the Tariff Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 353.22.

Dated: September 13, 1995.
Susan G. Esserman,
Assistant Secretary for Import
Administration.

[FR Doc. 95-23794 Filed 9-25-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-M

USEPA, et al.; Notice of Consolidated Decision on Applications for Duty-Free Entry of Scientific Instruments

This is a decision consolidated pursuant to Section 6(c) of the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966 (Pub. L. 89-651, 80 Stat. 897; 15 CFR part 301). Related records can be viewed between 8:30 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. in Room 4211, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Comments: None received. *Decision:* Approved. No instrument of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instruments described below, for such purposes as each is intended to be used, is being manufactured in the United States.

Docket Number: 95-017. *Applicant:* USEPA, Central Regional Laboratory, Chicago, IL 60605. *Instrument:* ICP Mass Spectrometer, Model PlasmaQuad. *Manufacturer:* Fisons Instruments, United Kingdom. *Intended Use:* See notice at 60 FR 19571, April 19, 1995. *Reasons:* The foreign instrument provides: (1) a detection limit of no greater than 10 ng/L and (2) broad dynamic range up to 10⁸ more concentrated than detection limits for Ag, Be, and Tl. *Advice Received From:* The National Institutes of Health, July 10, 1995.

Docket Number: 95-018. *Applicant:* Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL 32306. *Instrument:* Mass Spectrometer, Model 262. *Manufacturer:* Finnigan MAT, Germany. *Intended Use:* See notice at 60 FR 19571, April 19, 1995. *Reasons:* The foreign instrument provides: (1) high intensity, high sensitivity thermal ionization source, (2) multi-element Faraday cup ion detection system and (3) resolution >500 (10% valley definition) with abundance sensitivity of ≤2PPM at 237 1u (U). *Advice Received From:* The National Institutes of Health, July 10, 1995.

Docket Number: 95-019. *Applicant:* Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, Woods Hole, MA 02543. *Instrument:* Mass Spectrometer, Model IMS 1270. *Manufacturer:* Cameca Geologie, France. *Intended Use:* See notice at 60 FR 19571, April 19, 1995. *Reasons:* The

foreign instrument provides: (1) high mass resolution up to 50 000 (2) direct ion imaging and (3) ion microprobe capabilities. *Advice Received From:* The National Institutes of Health, July 10, 1995.

Docket Number: 95-033. *Applicant:* University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC 29208. *Instrument:* Mass Spectrometer, Model OPTIMA. *Manufacturer:* Fisons Instruments, United Kingdom. *Intended Use:* See notice at 60 FR 29826, June 6, 1995. *Reasons:* The foreign instrument provides: (1) an element analyzer with sample size capability of 1 mg to <30 mg, (2) absolute sensitivity of 1100 molecules of CO₂ per m/z 44 ion, and (3) data acquisition and integration of the thermal conductivity signal from the Elemental Analyzer. *Advice Received From:* The National Institutes of Health, July 12, 1995.

Docket Number: 95-048. *Applicant:* University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, NE 68588-0111. *Instrument:* Integrated Sensors, Model MD100. *Manufacturer:* Integrated Sensors Ltd., United Kingdom. *Intended Use:* See notice at 60 FR 35552, July 10, 1995. *Reasons:* The foreign instrument provides an array of 116 detectors, each having a built-in microchip containing discriminators and amplifiers, with low noise and crosstalk and high (linear) spatial resolution for x-ray analysis of ionized gases. *Advice Received From:* The National Institute of Standards and Technology, August 31, 1995.

Docket Number: 95-050. *Applicant:* North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC 27695-7212. *Instrument:* Mass Spectrometer, Model IMS-6f. *Manufacturer:* Cameca Instruments, France. *Intended Use:* See notice at 60 FR 35552, July 10, 1995. *Reasons:* The foreign instrument provides electrostatic sector/magnetic sector design for: (1) sensitivity to 7.0 x 10⁻¹² atoms/cm² for B in Si, (2) mass resolving power to 3.0 x 10¹³ atoms/cm² for P in Si and (3) dynamic depth profiling capability. *Advice Received From:* The National Institute of Standards and Technology, August 29, 1995.

Docket Number: 95-051. *Applicant:* National Renewable Energy Laboratory, Golden, CO 80401. *Instrument:* Sonic Anemometer/Thermometer. *Manufacturer:* Kaijo-Denki, Co. Inc., Ltd., Japan. *Intended Use:* See notice at 60 FR 37051, July 19, 1995. *Reasons:* The foreign instrument provides: (1) wind speed capability to 60 m/s, (2) 10 Hz bandwidth and (3) resolution to 0.005 m/s for measurement of small-scale atmospheric turbulence. *Advice Received From:* The National Oceanic